arXiv:1406.6751v2 [math.ST] 9 Oct 2014

Moment convergence in regularized estimations*

Hiroki Masuda† and Yusuke Shimizu‡

Abstract

In this paper we study uniform tail-probability estimates in regularized estimation, by making use of the polynomial type large deviation inequality for the associated statistical random fields. The statistical random fields in our model setup may be of mixed-rates type, may not be locally asymptotically quadratic. Our results provide a measure of rate of consistency in variable selection in sparse estimation, and also enable us to verify various arguments requiring convergence of moments of estimator-dependent statistics, such as the expected maximum-likelihood for AIC-type model criteria.

1 Introduction

Let us begin with some basic facts concerning the parametric M-estimation. Given a statistical model indexed by a finite-dimensional parameter $\theta_0 \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ we typically estimate the parameter value by a minimum point $\hat{\theta}_n$ of an appropriate continuous contrast function $Z_n : \Theta \to \mathbb{R}$. In order to assess the asymptotic performance of $\hat{\theta}_n$ quantitatively, we look at the statistical random fields

$$\mathbb{M}_n(u;\theta_0) = Z_n(\theta_0 + A_n(\theta_0)u) - Z_n(\theta_0), \tag{1.1}$$

where $A_n(\theta_0)$ denotes the rate matrix such that $|A_n(\theta_0)| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, where the components of $A_n(\theta_0)$ may decrease at different rates. As is well-known, the weak convergence of $\mathbb{M}_n$ to some $\mathbb{M}_0$ over compact sets, the identifiability condition on $\mathbb{M}_0$, and the tightness of the scaled estimator $\hat{u}_n := A_n(\theta_0)^{-1}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0)$ make the "argmin" functional continuous for $\mathbb{M}_n$: $\hat{u}_n \in \operatorname{argmin} \mathbb{M}_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \operatorname{argmin} \mathbb{M}_0$. See e.g., van der Vaart [9]. Further, when concerned with moments of $\hat{u}_n$-dependent statistics, such as the mean square error, more than the weak convergence is required. Then the polynomial type large deviation inequality (PLDI) of Yoshida [10], which estimates the tail of $\mathcal{L}(\hat{u}_n)$ in such a way that

$$\sup_{r>0} \sup_{n>0} r^L P(|\hat{u}_n| \geq r) < \infty \tag{1.2}$$

for a given $L > 0$, plays an important role. When $\hat{u}_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \hat{u}_0$ for a random variable $\hat{u}_0$, the moment convergence $E[|\hat{u}_n|^q] \to E[|\hat{u}_0|^q]$ where $q > 0$ holds if there exists $q' > q$ such

*This version:October 10, 2014

†Institute of Mathematics for Industry, Kyushu University.

‡Graduate school of Mathematics, Kyushu University.

that

$$\sup_{n>0} E[|\hat{u}_n|^{q'}] < \infty.$$

Assume that the PLDI (1.2) holds for some $L > q'$. Then we obtain

$$\sup_{n>0} E[|\hat{u}_n|^{q'}] = \sup_{n>0} \int_0^\infty P(|\hat{u}_n|^{q'} > s) ds < \infty.$$

Hence the moment convergence follows from the PLDI (1.2).

It has been known that the PLDI can be proved under modest conditions when $\mathbb{M}_n$ admit a partially locally asymptotically quadratic (PLAQ) structure, which is satisfied for many situations including asymptotically mixed-normal type models under multi-scaling. Here, in the multi-scaling case where the random vector $\hat{\theta}_n$ converges at different rates, the PLAQ structure at "first" step takes the form[1]

$$\mathbb{M}_n(u, \tau; \theta_0) = \Delta_n(\tau; \theta_0)[u] + \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_0(\tau; \theta_0)[u, u] + r_n(u, \tau; \theta_0),$$

where we are required to verify, among others, the following conditions which are to hold uniformly in "the second- and the subsequent-step" parameter τ, which is regarded as a nuisance parameter in the first step: sufficient integrability of the random linear form $\Delta_n(\tau; \theta_0)$; the non-degeneracy of the possibly random bilinear form $\Gamma_0(\tau; \theta_0)$; and a kind of "non-explosiveness" of the scaled remainder term $(1 + |u|^2)^{-1} r_n(u, \tau; \theta_0)$, where the u-pointwise limit of $r_n(u, \tau; \theta_0)$, whenever exists, typically equals zero. See Section 5 of Yoshida [10] for the detailed account of the above-mentioned multistep procedures. In many standard statistical models, the form (1.1) is enough to find the asymptotic distribution of all the components of $\hat{\theta}_n$; we call this case *standard asymptotics*.

The purpose of this paper is to prove the PLDI in the bridge and sparse-bridge least-squares estimation for the linear regression model. We will show how the PLDI of Yoshida [10] can carry over to the "mixed-rates" M-estimation where the target statistical random field may have components converging at different rates. See Radchenko [5] and also Section 3.2 for the general framework. In particular, we will mainly deal with the *sparse asymptotics*, where it may be possible to estimate zero parameters, say $z_0 = 0$, in such a way that $P(\hat{z}_n = 0) \to 1$, which implies that $R_n \hat{z}_n = o_p(1)$ for arbitrary $R_n \to \infty$, so that there is no sensible rate of convergence leading to a non-trivial asymptotic law in estimating $z_0 = 0$. It will be shown that the PLDI criterion of Yoshida [10] can apply to some mixed-rates cases while it may require some modification when the key PLAQ structure breaks down; it may happen that $r_n(u, \tau; \theta_0)$ diverges in probability. Indeed, most of the existing sparse estimation procedures may fall into this type of asymptotics. Our claims provide a theoretically deeper understanding on the recently highlighted sparse estimation.

Finally, we briefly remark the importance of convergence of moments: asymptotic behavior of expcted values of statistics depending on estimators. The PLDI for statistical random fields associated with stochastic process have been studied and applied

[1]The sign in front of the quadratic term $(1/2)\Gamma_0(\tau; \theta_0)[u, u]$ is different from the original PLAQ of Yoshida [10] since we consider minimization of (1.1).

for example to the information criteria in model selection, and moment convergence for quasi-likelihood and Bayes estimators of diffusion processes; see Uchida and Yoshida [7, 8], Sakamoto and Yoshida [6], and Yoshida [10] for details.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we discuss the PLDI conditions for the bridge least-squares estimation of the linear regression model. In particular, we consider the sparse-bridge estimation based on Radchenko [4]. Section 3 discusses some possible generalizations of the bridge-LSE setting. In Section 3.1, we consider a generalization of the regularization term in the bridge-LSE contrast function under the linear regression frame work. In Section 3.2, we discuss a generalization of the bridge regression model to the general M-estimations under mixed-rates asymptotic. We consider the PLDI under such a generaliged model in Section 3.3. Section 4 again treats bridge-LSE, where the consistency of estimators to the true value of parameters no longer holds.

2 Bridge-LSE in the linear regression model

In this section we assume that we have a sample $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, where $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $X_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip}) \in \mathbb{R}^p$, obeying the linear regression model:

$$Y_i = \theta_0^\top X_i + \epsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \tag{2.1}$$

where θ_0 is a p-dimensional true value of parameter contained in the interior of a compact parameter space $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \cdots$ represent noises. Though not essential, we suppose that the covariate X is non-random; usually $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ are standardized from the beginning, but for brevity we omit the dependence of X_i and Y_i on n from the notation. Then we consider the bridge-LSE defined to be a minimizer of the contrast function

$$Z_n(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \theta^\top X_i)^2 + \lambda_n \sum_{j=1}^p |\theta_j|^\gamma, \tag{2.2}$$

where λ_n denotes the tuning parameter controlling the degree of regularization together with the bridge index $\gamma > 0$. Denote by $\hat{\theta}_n$ a minimizer of Z_n over Θ.

2.1 Standard asymptotics

Knight and Fu [3] studied the "standard" asymptotic behaviour of $\hat{\theta}_n$. They assumed regularity conditions including that the noises $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \cdots$ are i.i.d. with $E[\epsilon_i] = 0$ and $E[\epsilon_i^2] =: \sigma^2 > 0$, $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^\top \to C_0$ for some $C_0 > 0$ and that $n^{-1} \max_{i \le n} |X_i|^2 \to 0$. Then they proved the following results:

(Consistency) If $\lambda_n / n \to 0$, then

$$\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{P} \theta_0.$$

(Asymptotic laws) If $\lambda_n / n^{(1 \wedge \gamma)/2} \to \lambda_0 \ge 0$, then

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \operatorname{argmin}(V_0),$$

where for $W \sim N_p(0, \sigma^2 C_0)$,

$$V_0(u) := \begin{cases} -2W[u] + C_0[u,u] + \gamma\lambda_0 \sum_{j=1}^{p} u_j \operatorname{sgn}(\theta_{0j})|\theta_{0j}|^{\gamma-1} & (\gamma > 1), \\ -2W[u] + C_0[u,u] & \\ \quad +\lambda_0 \sum_{j=1}^{p} \{u_j \operatorname{sgn}(\theta_{0j})\mathrm{I}(\theta_{0j} \neq 0) + |u_j|\mathrm{I}(\theta_{0j} = 0)\} & (\gamma = 1), \\ -2W[u] + C_0[u,u] + \lambda_0 \sum_{j=1}^{p} |u_j|^{\gamma}\mathrm{I}(\theta_{0j} = 0) & (\gamma < 1). \end{cases}$$

Let $\hat{u}_n := \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0)$ and $\hat{u}_0 := \operatorname{argmin}(V_0)$. In the following Theorem 2.1, we will deduce the moment convergence of $\hat{u}_n$, in particular $E[f(\hat{u}_n)] \to E[f(\hat{u}_0)]$ where $f : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}$ is any continuous functions of at most polynomial growth, by checking the PLDI conditions [A1]–[A6] of Yoshida [10, Theorem 1]. Theorem 2.1 is concerned with the standard asymptotics, but it is nevertheless new, providing the moment convergence with the associated random fields being not locally asymptotically quadratic.

Theorem 2.1 *Let $\gamma > 0$ and $C_n := n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i X_i^{\top}$. Suppose that $\lambda_n / n^{(1\wedge\gamma)/2} \to \lambda_0 \geq 0$ and that followings hold.*

$$\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \cdots \text{ are i.i.d. with } E[\epsilon_i] = 0 \text{ and } \forall k > 0,\ E[|\epsilon_i|^k] < \infty; \tag{2.3}$$

$$\exists \delta > 0,\ \exists C_0 > 0,\ \sup_{n>0}\big(n^{\delta}|C_n - C_0|\big) < \infty; \tag{2.4}$$

$$\sup_{n>0}\sup_{i\leq n}|X_i| < \infty. \tag{2.5}$$

Then for any $L > 0$ there exists a constant $c_L > 0$ for which

$$\sup_{n>0} P(|\hat{u}_n| \geq r) \leq \frac{c_L}{r^L}, \quad r > 0. \tag{2.6}$$

In particular, for every continuous $f : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}$ of at most polynomial growth,

$$E[f(\hat{u}_n)] \to E[f(\hat{u}_0)].$$

Proof To conclude (2.6), we will check the conditions [*A*1]–[*A*6] of Yoshida [10, Theorem 1]:

- $\Xi := \Theta \times \mathcal{T}$, where $\mathcal{T}$ is arbitrary sets.
- $\xi_0 := (\theta_0, \tau_0) \in K \subset \Xi$, where ξ_0 is a true value of parameter and K is arbitrary fixed sets.

- $\mathbb{U}_n(\xi_0) := \big\{u \in \mathbb{R}^p : \ \theta_0 + n^{-1/2}u \in \Theta\big\}$.
- $\mathbb{M}_n(u, \tau; \theta_0) := Z_n\big(\theta_0 + n^{-1/2}u, \tau\big) - Z_n(\theta_0, \tau)$.
- $\mathbb{Y}_n(\theta, \tau; \xi_0) := -n^{-1}\big(Z_n(\theta, \tau) - Z_n(\theta_0, \tau)\big) \xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{Y}_0(\theta, \tau; \xi_0)$.
- PLAQ (partially locally asymptotically quadratic) structure: $\forall (u, \tau) \in \mathbb{U}_n(\xi_0) \times \mathcal{T}$, $\exists \Delta_n(\tau; \xi_0) \in \mathbb{R}^p$: random, $\exists \Gamma_0(\tau; \xi_0) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^p$: random, $\exists r_n(u, \tau; \xi_0) \in \mathbb{R}$: random,

$$\mathbb{M}_n(u, \tau; \theta_0) = \Delta_n(\tau; \xi_0)[u] + \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_0(\tau; \xi_0)[u, u] + r_n(u, \tau; \xi_0). \tag{2.7}$$

- $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $U_n(r, \xi_0) := \big\{u \in \mathbb{R}^p : \ r \le |u| \le n^{(1-\alpha)/2}\big\}$.

[$A1$] $\exists \nu_1 > 0$, $\forall L > 0$, $\exists c_L > 0$: constant, $\forall r > 0$,

$$\sup_{\xi_0 \in K} \sup_{n > 0} P\Big(\sup_{(u,\tau) \in U_n(r, \xi_0) \times \mathcal{T}} \frac{|r_n(u, \tau; \xi_0)|}{1 + |u|^2} \ge r^{-\nu_1} \Big) \le \frac{c_L}{r^L}.$$

[$A2$] $\forall L > 0$, $\exists c_L > 0$: constant, $\forall r > 0$,

$$\sup_{\xi_0 \in K} P\Big[\big\{ \omega : \ r^{-\nu_1}|u|^2 > \Gamma_0(\tau; \xi_0)/4[u, u], \ \forall (u, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathcal{T} \big\} \Big] \le \frac{c_L}{r^L}.$$

[$A3$] $\forall \xi_0 \in K$, $\forall \theta \in \Theta$, $\forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}$, $\exists \chi(\xi_0)$: positive random variable, $\exists \nu = \nu(\xi_0) > 0$,

$$\mathbb{Y}_0(\theta, \tau; \xi_0) = \mathbb{Y}_0(\theta, \tau; \xi_0) - \mathbb{Y}_0(\theta_0, \tau; \xi_0) \le -\chi(\xi_0)|\theta - \theta_0|^{\nu}.$$

[$A4$]

$$\alpha \in (0, 1), \ \nu_1 \in (0, 1), \ \alpha\nu < \nu_2, \ \beta \in [0, \infty), \ 1 - 2\beta - \nu_2 > 0.$$

[$A5$] $\exists c_L > 0$: constant, $\forall r > 0$,

$$\sup_{\xi_0 \in K} P\big\{ \chi(\xi_0) \le r^{-(\nu_2 - \alpha\nu)} \big\} \le \frac{c_L}{r^L}.$$

[$A6$] $\forall L > 0$, $M_1 := L(1 - \nu_1)^{-1}$,

$$\sup_{\xi_0 \in K} \sup_{n > 0} E\Big[\Big(\sup_{\tau \in T} |\Delta_n(\tau; \xi_0)| \Big)^{M_1} \Big] < \infty;$$

$\forall L > 0$, $M_2 := L(1 - 2\beta - \nu_2)^{-1}$,

$$\sup_{\xi_0 \in K} \sup_{n > 0} E\Big[\Big(\sup_{(\theta,\tau) \in \Theta \times \mathcal{T}} n^{1/2-\beta} \big| \mathbb{Y}_n(\theta, \tau; \xi_0) - \mathbb{Y}_0(\theta, \tau; \xi_0) \big| \Big)^{M_2} \Big] < \infty.$$

Note that we use some different notations from the original Yoshida [10, Theorem 1]. In this case, we do not have the parameter equivalent to τ, so we omit the notations. We have

$$\mathbb{M}_n(u; \theta_0) = Z_n\Big(\theta_0 + \frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) - Z_n(\theta_0)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big\{\Big(\epsilon_i - \frac{X_i^\top}{\sqrt{n}}u\Big)^2 - \epsilon_i^2\Big\} + \lambda_n \sum_{j=1}^{p}\Big(\Big|\theta_{0j} + \frac{u_j}{\sqrt{n}}\Big|^\gamma - \big|\theta_{0j}\big|^\gamma\Big)$$
$$= -\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}\epsilon_i X_i[u] + \frac{1}{2}(2C_0)[u,u] + (C_n - C_0)[u,u]$$
$$+ \lambda_n \sum_{j=1}^{p}\Big(\Big|\theta_{0j} + \frac{u_j}{\sqrt{n}}\Big|^\gamma - \big|\theta_{0j}\big|^\gamma\Big).$$

and the PLAQ structure (2.7) with

$$\Delta_n(\theta_0) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}\epsilon_i X_i; \tag{2.8}$$
$$\Gamma_0(\theta_0) = 2C_0; \tag{2.9}$$
$$r_n(u;\theta_0) = (C_n - C_0)[u,u] + \lambda_n \sum_{j=1}^{p}\Big(\Big|\theta_{0j} + \frac{u_j}{\sqrt{n}}\Big|^\gamma - \big|\theta_{0j}\big|^\gamma\Big). \tag{2.10}$$

From $\lambda_n/n \to 0$, (2.3) and (2.4), we obtain for any $\theta \in \Theta$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{Y}_n(\theta;\theta_0) &:= -\frac{1}{n}\big(Z_n(\theta) - Z_n(\theta_0)\big)\\ &= -\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\big\{\epsilon_i - (\theta-\theta_0)^\top X_i\big\}^2 + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\epsilon_i^2 - \frac{\lambda_n}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p}\big(|\theta_j|^\gamma - |\theta_{0j}|^\gamma\big)\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{2}{n}\epsilon_i X_i[\theta-\theta_0] - C_n[\theta-\theta_0,\theta-\theta_0] - \frac{\lambda_n}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p}\big(|\theta_j|^\gamma - |\theta_{0j}|^\gamma\big)\\ &\xrightarrow{P} -C_0[\theta-\theta_0,\theta-\theta_0] =: \mathbb{Y}_0(\theta;\theta_0).\end{aligned}$$

We get $\mathbb{Y}_0(\theta;\theta_0) \le -\lambda_{\min}(C_0)|\theta-\theta_0|^2$ where $\lambda_{\min}(C_0)$ denotes the minimal eigenvalue of the C_0. Since C_0 is deterministic, we notice from Yoshida [10, Theorem 3(a)] that we only need to check conditions $[A1]$, $[A4]$, $[A6]$, $[B1]$ and $[B2]$:

$[B1]$ $\Gamma_0(\tau;\xi_0)$ is deterministic and positive-definite uniformly in $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\xi_0 \in K$.

$[B2]$ $\exists\chi = \chi(\xi_0) > 0$: non-random, $\exists\nu = \nu(\xi_0) > 0$, $\forall\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\mathbb{Y}_0(\theta;\theta_0) \le -\chi|\theta-\theta_0|^\nu.$$

Apparently $[B1]$ holds from (2.4) and (2.9), and also $[B2]$ holds with $\chi(\theta_0) = \lambda_{\min}(C_0)$ and $\nu(\theta_0) = 2$, so that it remains to verify $[A1]$, $[A4]$ and $[A6]$.

First, we will verify $[A1]$. From (2.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{u\in U_n(r,\theta_0)}\frac{|r_n(u;\theta_0)|}{1+|u|^2} \le{}& \sup_{u\in U_n(r,\theta_0)}\Big(\frac{|u|^2}{1+|u|^2}|C_n - C_0|\Big)\\ &+ \sup_{u\in U_n(r,\theta_0)}\Big\{\frac{\lambda_n}{1+|u|^2}\Big|\sum_{j=1}^{p}\Big(\Big|\theta_{0j} + \frac{u_j}{\sqrt{n}}\Big|^\gamma - \big|\theta_{0j}\big|^\gamma\Big)\Big|\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Let us fix β such that $0 \vee (1/2 - \delta) \le \beta < 1/2$. Then,

$$|C_n - C_0| = n^{\beta - 1/2} n^{1/2 - \beta - \delta} \big(n^{\delta} |C_n - C_0| \big).$$

Let $\nu_2 > 0$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $\xi > 0$ be such that $1 - 2\beta > \nu_2 > 2\alpha$ and $0 < \xi < (2\alpha/(1-\alpha)) \wedge 1$. Note that these parameters meet $\beta - 1/2 + (1-\alpha)\xi/2 < 0$. Then for the first term of the right-hand side of (2.11), we get

$$\sup_{u \in U_n(r,\theta_0)} \Big(\frac{|u|^2}{1+|u|^2} n^{\beta - 1/2} |u|^{\xi} |u|^{-\xi} \Big) \le n^{\beta - 1/2} n^{(1-\alpha)\xi/2} r^{-\xi} \lesssim r^{-\xi},$$

where $f(x) \lesssim g(x)$ denotes there exists a constant c such that $f(x) \le c g(x)$. Hence, we obtain from (2.4),

$$\sup_{u \in U_n(r,\theta_0)} \Big(\frac{|u|^2}{1+|u|^2} |C_n - C_0| \Big) \lesssim r^{-\xi}. \tag{2.12}$$

Next we consider the second term of the right-hand side of (2.11). When $\gamma > 1$, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ we have on $U_n(r, \theta_0)$ from the Taylor expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} \Big| \big| \theta_{0j} + \frac{u_j}{\sqrt{n}} \big|^{\gamma} - \big| \theta_{0j} \big|^{\gamma} \Big| &\le \frac{\gamma |u_j|}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^1 \Big| \big| \theta_{0j} \big| + \big| \frac{u_j}{\sqrt{n}} s \big| \Big|^{\gamma - 1} ds \\ &\le \frac{\gamma |u_j|}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^1 \Big| \big| \theta_{0j} \big| + n^{-\alpha/2} s \Big|^{\gamma - 1} ds \lesssim \frac{|u_j|}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u \in U_n(r,\theta_0)} \Big\{ \frac{\lambda_n}{1+|u|^2} \Big| \sum_{j=1}^{p} \Big(\big| \theta_{0j} + \frac{u_j}{\sqrt{n}} \big|^{\gamma} - \big| \theta_{0j} \big|^{\gamma} \Big) \Big| \Big\} &\lesssim \frac{\lambda_n}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{u \in U_n(r,\theta_0)} \Big(\frac{1}{1+|u|^2} \sum_{j=1}^{p} |u_j| \Big) \\ &\lesssim \frac{\lambda_n}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{u \in U_n(r,\theta_0)} \Big(\frac{|u|}{1+|u|^2} \Big) \\ &\lesssim \frac{\lambda_n}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{1}{r}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

On the other hand, when $\gamma \le 1$, we easily get for any $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$

$$\Big| \big| \theta_{0j} + \frac{u_j}{\sqrt{n}} \big|^{\gamma} - \big| \theta_{0j} \big|^{\gamma} \Big| \le \Big| \frac{u_j}{\sqrt{n}} \Big|^{\gamma},$$

so that we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u \in U_n(r,\theta_0)} \Big\{ \frac{\lambda_n}{1+|u|^2} \Big| \sum_{j=1}^{p} \Big(\big| \theta_{0j} + \frac{u_j}{\sqrt{n}} \big|^{\gamma} - \big| \theta_{0j} \big|^{\gamma} \Big) \Big| \Big\} &\le \frac{\lambda_n}{n^{\gamma/2}} \sup_{u \in U_n(r,\theta_0)} \Big(\frac{1}{1+|u|^2} \sum_{j=1}^{p} |u_j|^{\gamma} \Big) \\ &\lesssim \frac{\lambda_n}{n^{\gamma/2}} \sup_{u \in U_n(r,\theta_0)} \Big(\frac{|u|}{1+|u|^2} \Big) \\ &\lesssim \frac{\lambda_n}{n^{\gamma/2}} \frac{1}{r}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

Let $\nu_1 \in (0, \xi)$ fix. Then, from (2.11), (2.12), (2.13) and (2.14), we have for any $L > 0$

$$\sup_{n>0} P\Big(\sup_{u \in U_n(r,\theta_0)} \frac{|r_n(u;\theta_0)|}{1+|u|^2} \gtrsim r^{-\nu_1} \Big) \lesssim \frac{1}{r^L}.$$

We conclude that [$A1$] holds, and [$A4$] also holds with taking the parameters as above.

Second, we will verify [$A6$]. From (2.8), let $\Delta_n(\theta_0) = \sum_{i=1}^n (-2/\sqrt{n})\epsilon_i X_i =: \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_{ni}$. Then by using Burkholder's inequality and Jensen's inequality we obtain for $N_1 = L(1-\nu_1)^{-1} \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{n>0} E\Big[\big|\Delta_n(\theta_0)\big|^{N_1} \Big] &\leq \sup_{n>0} E\Big[\max_{j \leq n} \Big| \sum_{i=1}^j \chi_{ni} \Big|^{N_1} \Big] \\
&\lesssim \sup_{n>0} E\Big[\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n \chi_{ni}^2 \Big)^{N_1/2} \Big] \\
&\lesssim \sup_{n>0} E\Big[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \big|\epsilon_i X_i\big|^{2 \cdot N_1/2} \Big] \\
&= E\big[|\epsilon_1|^{N_1} \big] \cdot \sup_{n>0} \Big(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |X_i|^{N_1} \Big) < \infty. \qquad (2.15)
\end{aligned}$$

The last boundedness of (2.15) follows from (2.3) and (2.5). Moreover, we get for any $\theta \in \Theta$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{n} \epsilon_i X_i [\theta - \theta_0] - C_n[\theta - \theta_0, \theta - \theta_0] \xrightarrow{P} -C_0[\theta - \theta_0, \theta - \theta_0];$$

$$\frac{\lambda_n}{n} \sum_{j=1}^p \big(|\theta_j|^\gamma - |\theta_{0j}|^\gamma \big) \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Since $(a+b)^k \lesssim a^k + b^k$ where $a, b \geq 0$ and $k \geq 1$, we have for $N_2 = L(1-2\beta-\nu_2)^{-1} \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{n>0} E\Big[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \Big(n^{1/2-\beta} \Big| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{n} \epsilon_i X_i [\theta - \theta_0] - C_n[\theta - \theta_0, \theta - \theta_0] + C_0[\theta - \theta_0, \theta - \theta_0] \Big| \Big)^{N_2} \Big] \\
&\lesssim \sup_{n>0} \Big(n^{-\beta N_2} E\Big[\Big| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \epsilon_i X_i \Big|^{N_2} \Big] \Big) + \Big\{ \sup_{n>0} \big(n^{1/2-\beta-\delta} n^\delta |C_n - C_0| \big) \Big\}^{N_2} < \infty. \qquad (2.16)
\end{aligned}$$

Further, we obtain

$$\sup_{n>0} E\Big[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \Big\{ n^{1/2-\beta} \Big| \frac{\lambda_n}{n} \sum_{j=1}^p \big(|\theta_j|^\gamma - |\theta_{0j}|^\gamma \big) \Big| \Big\}^{N_2} \Big] \lesssim \sup_{n>0} \Big(\frac{\lambda_n}{n^{1/2+\beta}} \Big)^{N_2} < \infty. \qquad (2.17)$$

From (2.15), (2.16) and (2.17), we conclude that [$A6$] holds. □

Remark 2.2 We could deal with random design (X_i). Assume for simplicity that (X_i) and (ϵ_j) are independent. Then in order to conclude (2.6), we need to change (2.4) and (2.5) into (2.18) and (2.19), respectively:

$$\exists \delta > 0,\ \exists C_0 > 0 : \text{constant},\ \forall k > 0,\ \sup_{n>0} E\big[\big|n^{\delta}(C_n - C_0)\big|^k\big] < \infty. \tag{2.18}$$

$$\forall k > 0,\ \sup_{n>0} \sup_{i \le n} E\big[|X_i|^k\big] < \infty. \tag{2.19}$$

□

Remark 2.3 For all $i \in \{1, \ldots .n\}$, let $\widetilde{X}_i := C_n^{-1/2}(X_i - \bar{X})$ where $\bar{X} := n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are not necessarily standardized. Then $n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{X}_i \widetilde{X}_i^{\top} = I_p$ where I_p is a $p \times p$ diagonal matrix. This implies that if $X_i, \ldots, X_n$ are standardized from the beginning such that $C_n = I_p$, (2.4) and (2.18) automatically hold. □

2.2 Sparse asymptotics

In this section, we deal with the situation:

$$\theta_0 = (z_0, \rho_0) = (z_{0,1}, \ldots, z_{0,p_0}, \rho_{0,1}, \ldots, \rho_{0,p_1}),$$

where $z_{0,k} = 0$ and $\rho_{0,l} \neq 0$ for any $k \in \{1, \ldots, p_0\}$ and $l \in \{1, \ldots, p_1\}$. Then we can rewrite the linear regression model (2.1) and the contrast function (2.2) as follows:

$$Y_i = \rho_0^{\top} X_i^{(\rho)} + \epsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n;$$
$$Z_n(\theta) = Z_n(z, \rho) = \sum_{i=1}^n \big(Y_i - z^{\top} X_i^{(z)} - \rho^{\top} X_i^{(\rho)}\big)^2 + \lambda_n \sum_{k=1}^{p_0} |z_k|^{\gamma} + \lambda_n \sum_{l=1}^{p_1} |\rho_l|^{\gamma},$$

where $X_i^{(z)} := (X_{i,1}, \ldots, X_{i,p_0})$ and $X_i^{(\rho)} := (X_{i,p_0+1}, \ldots, X_{i,p_0+p_1})$. Denote by $\hat{\theta}_n = (\hat{z}_n, \hat{\rho}_n)$ a minimizer of Z_n over a compact parameter space $\Theta_0 \times \Theta_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$. We here consider the "sparse-bridge" estimation, where $P(\hat{z}_n = 0) \to 1$.

Suppose $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and let

$$\Upsilon := \frac{\gamma}{2}\{\mathrm{sgn}(\rho_{0,1})|\rho_{0,1}|^{\gamma-1}, \ldots, \mathrm{sgn}(\rho_{0,p_1})|\rho_{0,p_1}|^{\gamma-1}\}$$

and B_0 be the $p_1 \times p_1$ submatrix located in the bottom right corner of the matrix C_0. Then Radchenko [4] proved the followings:

- The sparse consistency of $\hat{z}_n$:

$$P(\hat{z}_n = 0) \to 1 \text{ if } \lambda_n / n^{\gamma/2} \to \infty \text{ and } \lambda_n / n \to 0.$$

- The asymptotic behaviour of $\hat{\rho}_n$:

  (i) $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_0) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N_{p_1}(-\lambda_0 B_0^{-1}\Upsilon, \sigma^2 B_0^{-1})$ if $\lambda_n / n^{\gamma/2} \to \infty$ and $\lambda_n / \sqrt{n} \to \lambda_0 \geq 0$;

(ii) $n\lambda_n^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_0) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} -B_0^{-1}\Upsilon$ if $\lambda_n/\sqrt{n} \to \infty$ and $\lambda_n/n \to 0$.

We will consider the moment convergence of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0)$. With regard to the asymptotic law of the non-zero parameter ρ, we only consider the case (i), where the asymptotic distribution is non-degenerate. To this end, we will make use of the multistep-PLDI argument of Yoshida [10] where: at the first step, we derive a PLDI for the random fields associated with the zero parameter z (z-PLDI), with regarding the non-zero parameter ρ as a nuisance parameter (hence we derived a uniform-in-ρ PLDI); at the second step, we derive a PLDI for the random fields associated with the non-zero parameter ρ (ρ-PLDI) with plugging-in the estimator $\hat{z}_n$. At the first step, however, if $\lambda_n/n^{\gamma/2} \to \infty$, it is not appropriate to look at $u \mapsto Z_n(z_0 + n^{-1/2}u, \rho) - Z_n(z_0, \rho)$, since the regularization term

$$u \mapsto \lambda_n \sum_{k=1}^{p_0} \Big| \frac{u_k}{\sqrt{n}} \Big|^\gamma$$

diverges pointwise; then, we can not effectively use the region $U_n(r, \theta_0) = \big\{u \in \mathbb{R}^{p_0} : r \le |u| \le n^{(1-\alpha)/2}\big\}$ (see the proof of Theorem 2.1). Likewise, it is trivial that any rescaling of the form $u \mapsto q_n\{Z_n(z_0 + n^{-1/2}u, \rho) - Z_n(z_0, \rho)\}$ is not helpful. Hence we will take a modified route, bypassing a direct application of Yoshida [10]. We establish conditions for the z-PLDI in the following Theorem 2.4 by utilizing the special nature of the least-squares term.

Theorem 2.4 *Let $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Suppose that $\lambda_n/n^{\gamma/2} \to \infty$, $\lambda_n/n \to 0$, (2.3), (2.5) and*

$$\exists D_0 > 0,\ D_n \to D_0, \tag{2.20}$$

where D_n is the $p_0 \times p_0$ submatrix located in the upper left corner of the matrix C_n. Moreover, we suppose

$$\sup_{n>0} \Big| (\lambda_n/n^{\gamma/2})^{-1/2} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i^{(z)} \otimes X_i^{(\rho)}) \Big| < \infty. \tag{2.21}$$

Then for any $L > 0$ there exists a constant $c_L > 0$ for which

$$\sup_{n>0} P\big(|\sqrt{n}\hat{z}_n| \ge r\big) \le \frac{c_L}{r^L}, \quad r > 0.$$

Proof This Theorem equivalents to the direct corollary of the following Theorem 3.1, so that we omit the proof. □

Remark 2.5 If $X_i, \ldots, X_n$ are standardized from the beginning such that $C_n = I_p$, (2.21) holds. See Remark 2.3 for details. □

Following Theorem 2.6 ensures the moment convergence of $\big(\sqrt{n}\hat{z}_n, \sqrt{n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_0)\big)$ by using the multistep-PLDI argument.

Theorem 2.6 *Let* $\gamma \in (0,1)$. *Suppose that* $\lambda_n/n^{\gamma/2} \to \infty$, $\lambda_n/\sqrt{n} \to \lambda_0 \geq 0$, (2.3), (2.5), (2.20) *and*

$$\exists \delta > 0,\ \exists B_0 > 0,\ \sup_{n>0}(n^{\delta}|B_n - B_0|) < \infty, \tag{2.22}$$

where B_n *is the* $p_1 \times p_1$ *submatrix located in the bottom right corner of the matrix* C_n. *Moreover, we suppose that*

$$\sup_{n>0}\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_i^{(z)} \otimes X_i^{(\rho)})\Big| < \infty. \tag{2.23}$$

Then for any $L > 0$ *there exists a constant* $c_L > 0$ *for which*

$$\sup_{n>0} P\big(|\sqrt{n}\hat{z}_n| \wedge |\sqrt{n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_0)| \geq r\big) \leq \frac{c_L}{r^L}, \quad r > 0.$$

In particular, for every continuous $f : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}$ *of at most polynomial growth*

$$E\big[f\big(\sqrt{n}\hat{z}_n, \sqrt{n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_0)\big)\big] \to E[f(0, \hat{v}_0)],$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\hat{v}_0) = N_{p_1}(-\lambda_0 B_0^{-1}\Upsilon, \sigma^2 B_0^{-1})$.

Proof This Theorem also equivalents to the direct corollary of the following Theorem 3.2, so that we omit the proof. □

3 Discussion on generalization

In principle, any existing M-estimation procedure based on a contrast function $\mathbb{M}_n$ may have its regularized counterpart. We want to extend the structure of the random fields to subsume a broader class of M-estimation inducing the statistical random fields entailing a mixed-rates asymptotics, for possibly dependent data and regularization types other than the bridge. In Section 3.1, we will extend Theorem 2.4 and 2.6. Section 3.2 discusses a generalization of the model setup where we no longer assume the linear regression model structure (2.1) and the bridge-LSE contrast function (2.2), and then we consider the PLDI under such a generalized model in Section 3.3.

3.1 Generalization of the regularization term

We consider the linear regression model (2.1) where the true parameter $\theta_0 = (z_0, \rho_0) = (0, \rho_0) \in \Theta_0 \times \Theta_1$. Consider a class of contrast functions of the form

$$Z_n(\theta) = Z_n(z, \rho) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_i - z^{\top}X_i^{(z)} - \rho^{\top}X_i^{(\rho)})^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{p}\mathfrak{p}_n(z_j), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mathfrak{p}_n(\cdot)$ is a non-negative and non-random function such that $\mathfrak{p}_n(0) = 0$; though not specific, we may think of $\sum_{j=1}^{p}\mathfrak{p}_n(z_j)$ as a regularization term. In the present setting, it is possible to derive the z-PLDI by making use of the special nature of the least-squares term.

Theorem 3.1 *Assume that the contrast function is* (3.1)*. In addition to* (2.3), (2.5) *and* (2.20)*, we suppose that*

$$\sup_{n>0}\Big|q_n^{-1/2}n^{-1/2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_i^{(z)}\otimes X_i^{(\rho)})\Big|<\infty. \tag{3.2}$$

where q_n is a positive sequence. Moreover, we suppose the following conditions on $\mathfrak{p}_n(\cdot)$:

$$\inf_{|u|\geq r}\sum_{k=1}^{p_0}\mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\frac{u_k}{\sqrt{n}}\Big)\geq q_n f(r), \tag{3.3}$$

where $f(r)$ is a positive function such that $f(r)\to\infty$ as $r\to\infty$. Then for any $L>0$ there exists a constant $c_L>0$ for which

$$\sup_{n>0}P\big(|\sqrt{n}\hat{z}_n|\geq r\big)\leq\frac{c_L}{f(r)^L},\quad r>0. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof For $u\in\mathbb{R}^{p_0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{M}_n(u,\rho;\theta_0)&=Z_n\Big(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}},\rho\Big)-Z_n(0,\rho)\\&=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big[\Big\{\epsilon_i-\frac{u^\top}{\sqrt{n}}X_i^{(z)}-(\rho-\rho_0)^\top X_i^{(\rho)}\Big\}^2-\big\{\epsilon_i-(\rho-\rho_0)^\top X_i^{(\rho)}\big\}^2\Big]\\&\quad+\sum_{k=1}^{p_0}\mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\frac{u_k}{\sqrt{n}}\Big)\\&=-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}\big\{\epsilon_i-(\rho-\rho_0)^\top X_i^{(\rho)}\big\}X_i^{(z)}[u]+D_n[u,u]+\sum_{k=1}^{p_0}\mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\frac{u_k}{\sqrt{n}}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$S_n^\rho:=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}\big\{\epsilon_i-(\rho-\rho_0)^\top X_i^{(\rho)}\big\}X_i^{(z)}.$$

Since $Z_n(z,\rho)\geq Z_n(\hat{z}_n,\hat{\rho}_n)$ for any $(z,\rho)\in\Theta_0\times\Theta_1$, $Z_n(0,\hat{\rho}_n)-Z_n(\hat{z}_n,\hat{\rho}_n)\geq 0$ implies $\sup_{\rho\in\Theta_1}(1/q_n)\big\{Z_n(0,\rho)-Z_n(\hat{z}_n,\rho)\big\}\geq 0$. Therefore, we get for $\hat{u}_n=\sqrt{n}\hat{z}_n$

$$\begin{aligned}P\big(|\hat{u}_n|\geq r\big)&\leq P\Big[\sup_{\rho\in\Theta_1}\sup_{|u|\geq r}\Big\{-\frac{1}{q_n}\Big(Z_n\Big(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}},\rho\Big)-Z_n(0,\rho)\Big)\Big\}\geq 0\Big] &(3.5)\\&\leq P\Big\{\sup_{\rho\in\Theta_1}\sup_{|u|\geq r}\Big(\frac{S_n^\rho}{q_n}[u]-\frac{D_n}{q_n}[u,u]\Big)\geq\frac{1}{q_n}\inf_{|u|\geq r}\sum_{k=1}^{p_0}\mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\frac{u_k}{\sqrt{n}}\Big)\Big\}\\&\lesssim P\Big\{\sup_{\rho\in\Theta_1}\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{q_n}}S_n^\rho\Big|^2\geq\frac{1}{q_n}\inf_{|u|\geq r}\sum_{k=1}^{p_0}\mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\frac{u_k}{\sqrt{n}}\Big)\Big\} &(3.6)\end{aligned}$$

because the quadratic function $S_n^\rho/q_n[u]-D_n/q_n[u,u]$ has the maximum value $(1/4q_n)S_n^{\rho\top}D_n^{-1}S_n^\rho \lesssim |q_n^{-1/2}S_n^\rho|^2$. Therefore, from (3.3) and using Markov's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}P\big(|\hat{u}_n|\geq r\big) &\lesssim P\Big(\sup_{\rho\in\Theta_1}\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{q_n}}S_n^\rho\Big|^2\gtrsim f(r)\Big)\\ &\lesssim f(r)^{-L}\Big\{\Big|\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{nq_n}}\big(X_i^{(z)}\otimes X_i^{(\rho)}\big)\Big|^{2L}+q_n^{-L}E\Big[\Big|\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\epsilon_iX_i^{(z)}\Big|^{2L}\Big]\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

The first term of the right hand side is bounded under (3.2), and by using the same argument as in (2.15), we obtain

$$\sup_{n>0}E\Big[\Big|\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\epsilon_iX_i^{(z)}\Big|^{2L}\Big]\lesssim E\big[|\epsilon_1|^{2L}\big]\cdot\sup_{n>0}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n|X_i^{(z)}|^{2L}\Big)<\infty.$$

Hence we get the z-PLDI (3.4). □

In Theorem 3.1 we assumed (3.3), but it is rather restrictive. For example, SCAD (Fan and Li [2]) and the seamless L_0-regularization (Dicker et al. [1]) which approximates the (technically unpleasant) L_0-loss, do not satisfy (3.3) (see Remark 3.3 for details). To derive to the ρ-PLDI under the contrast function having such bounded regularization terms, we need some additional conditions on $\mathfrak{p}_n(\cdot)$. The following Theorem 3.2 is an extension of Theorem 2.6.

Theorem 3.2 *Assume that the contrast function is* (3.1)*. In addition to* (2.3)*,* (2.5) *and* (2.23)*, we suppose that*

$$\exists\delta>0,\ \exists B_0>0,\ \exists D_0>0,\ \sup_{n>0}(n^\delta|B_n-B_0|+n^\delta|D_n-D_0|)<\infty. \tag{3.7}$$

Moreover, we suppose the following conditions on $\mathfrak{p}_n(\cdot)$:

$$\exists\beta\in(0,1/2),\ \forall a\in\mathbb{R},\ \sup_{n>0}\frac{1}{n^{1/2+\beta}}\mathfrak{p}_n(a)<\infty; \tag{3.8}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\exists\kappa\in(0,2],\ \forall a\neq0,\ \forall b\in\mathbb{R},\ \exists c_{a,b}>0:\text{constant},\\ &\qquad\limsup_{n\to\infty}\Big|\mathfrak{p}_n\Big(a+\frac{b}{\sqrt{n}}\Big)-\mathfrak{p}_n(a)\Big|\leq c_{a,b}|b|^\kappa.\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Then for any $L>0$ *there exists a constant* $c_L>0$ *for which*

$$\sup_{n>0}P\big(|\sqrt{n}\hat{z}_n|\wedge|\sqrt{n}(\hat{\rho}_n-\rho_0)|\geq r\big)\leq\frac{c_L}{r^L},\quad r>0. \tag{3.10}$$

In particular, for every continuous $f:\mathbb{R}^p\to\mathbb{R}$ *of at most polynomial growth, we have*

$$E\big[f\big(\sqrt{n}\hat{z}_n,\sqrt{n}(\hat{\rho}_n-\rho_0)\big)\big]\to E[f(0,\hat{v}_0)],$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\hat{v}_0)$ *is an asymptotic law of* $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\rho}_n-\rho_0)$.

Proof Let $\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - z^\top X_i^{(z)} - \rho^\top X_i^{(\rho)})^2 =: M_n(z,\rho)$. As the first step, we derive the z-PLDI without supposing (3.3). In general, however,

$$\inf_{|u|\geq r} \sum_{k=1}^{p_0} \mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\frac{u_k}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) \geq 0 \tag{3.11}$$

holds since $\mathfrak{p}_n$ is a non-negative function, so that we notice

$$P(|\hat{u}_n| \geq r) \leq P\Big[\sup_{\rho\in\Theta_1}\sup_{|u|\geq r}\Big\{ - M_n\Big(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}},\rho\Big) + M_n(0,\rho)\Big\} \geq 0\Big]$$

holds from (3.5). Hence, for ensuring the z-PLDI, we only need to establish

$$\sup_{n>0} P\Big[\sup_{\rho\in\Theta_1}\sup_{|u|\geq r}\Big\{ - M_n\Big(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}},\rho\Big) + M_n(0,\rho)\Big\} \geq 0\Big] \leq \frac{c_L}{r^L}. \tag{3.12}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} -M_n\Big(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}},\rho\Big) + M_n(0,\rho) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}\epsilon_i X_i^{(z)}[u] - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}(X_i^{(\rho)}\otimes X_i^{(z)})[\rho-\rho_0,u] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}(2D_0)[u,u] + (D_0 - D_n)[u,u], \end{aligned}$$

and the PLAQ structure with

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta_n(\rho;\theta_0) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}\epsilon_i X_i^{(z)} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}(X_i^{(\rho)}\otimes X_i^{(z)})(\rho-\rho_0); \\ &\Gamma_0(\theta_0) = 2D_0; \\ &r_n(u;\theta_0) = (D_0 - D_n)[u,u]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

From (2.3) (3.7) and (3.8), we obtain for any $(z,\rho)\in\Theta_0\times\Theta_1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Y}_n(z,\rho;\theta_0) &:= -\frac{1}{n}\big(Z_n(z,\rho) - Z_n(0,\rho)\big) \\ &= \frac{2}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \{\epsilon_i - (\rho-\rho_0)^\top X_i^{(\rho)}\} z^\top X_i^{(z)} - D_n[z,z] - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{p_0}\mathfrak{p}_n(z_k) \\ &\xrightarrow{P} -D_0[z,z] =: \mathbb{Y}_0(z;\theta_0). \end{aligned}$$

We get $\mathbb{Y}_0(z;\theta_0) \leq -\lambda_{\min}(D_0)|z|^2$. Therefore, it remains to verify [A1], [A4] and [A6] of Yoshida [10, Theorem 1].

Take β, ν_2, α, ξ and ν_1 as in the proof of Theorem 2.1. We know these parameters satisfy [*A*4] and (3.8). Since

$$\sup_{u\in U_n(r,\theta_0)}\Big(\frac{|u|^2}{1+|u|^2}|D_n - D_0|\Big) \lesssim r^{-\xi}$$

holds from the same argument as in (2.12), we easily get [A1].

Second we will establish [A6]. Note that $\Theta_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$ is a compact set. From (2.23), (3.13), and using the same argument as in (2.15), we get for $N_1 = L(1-\nu_1)^{-1} \geq 2$

$$\sup_{n>0} E\Big[\sup_{\rho\in\Theta_1} \big|\Delta_n(\rho;\theta_0)\big|^{N_1}\Big] < \infty. \tag{3.14}$$

Moreover, we get for any $(z,\rho) \in \Theta_0 \times \Theta_1$

$$\frac{2}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \{\epsilon_i - (\rho-\rho_0)^\top X_i^{(\rho)}\} z^\top X_i^{(z)} - D_n[z,z] \xrightarrow{P} -D_0[z,z];$$

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{p_0} \mathfrak{p}_n(z_k) \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

since we have (2.3), (2.23), (3.7) and (3.8). Hence, we obtain for $N_2 = L(1-2\beta-\nu_2)^{-1} \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{n>0} E\Big[\sup_{(z,\rho)\in\Theta_0\times\Theta_1} \Big\{n^{1/2-\beta}\Big|\frac{2}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \{\epsilon_i - (\rho-\rho_0)^\top X_i^{(\rho)}\} z^\top X_i^{(z)} - D_n[z,z] + D_0[z,z]\Big|\Big\}^{N_2}\Big] \\
&\lesssim \sup_{n>0}\Big(n^{-\beta N_2} E\Big[\Big|\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\epsilon_i X_i^{(z)}\Big|^{N_2}\Big]\Big) + \sup_{n>0}\Big\{n^{-\beta}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\big(X_i^{(z)} \otimes X_i^{(\rho)}\big)\Big|\Big\}^{N_2} \\
&\quad + \sup_{n>0}\big(n^{1/2-\beta-\delta} n^\delta |D_0 - D_n|\big)^{N_2} < \infty.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Further, we get from (3.8)

$$\sup_{n>0} E\Big[\sup_{(z,\rho)\in\Theta_0\times\Theta_1} \Big(n^{1/2-\beta}\Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{p_0} \mathfrak{p}_n(z_k)\Big|\Big)^{N_2}\Big] < \infty. \tag{3.16}$$

From (3.14), (3.15) and (3.16), we conclude that [A6] holds. Therefore we obtain (3.12), hence the z-PLDI.

Next we consider the ρ-PLDI, using the multistep-PLDI argument of Yoshida [10] where plugging-in the estimator $\hat{z}_n$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{M}_n(v;\theta_0) &= Z_n\Big(\hat{z}_n, \rho_0 + \frac{v}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) - Z_n(\hat{z}_n, \rho_0) \\
&= -\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}\epsilon_i X_i^{(\rho)}[v] + \frac{1}{2}(2B_0)[v,v] + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}(X_i^{(z)} \otimes X_i^{(\rho)})[\hat{z}_n, v] \\
&\quad + (B_n - B_0)[v,v] + \sum_{l=1}^{p_1}\Big\{\mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\rho_{0l} + \frac{v_l}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\Big\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $v \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$. We have the PLAQ structure (2.7) with

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta_n(\theta_0) = -\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}\epsilon_i X_i^{(\rho)} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}(X_i^{(z)} \otimes X_i^{(\rho)})\hat{z}_n; \\
&\Gamma_0(\theta_0) = 2B_0;
\end{aligned}$$

$$r_n(v;\theta_0) = (B_n - B_0)[v,v] + \sum_{l=1}^{p_1}\Big\{\mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\rho_{0l} + \frac{v_l}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\Big\}. \tag{3.17}$$

Moreover, we obtain for any $\rho \in \Theta_1$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{Y}_n(\rho;\theta_0) &:= -\frac{1}{n}\big(Z_n(\hat{z}_n,\rho) - Z_n(\hat{z}_n,\rho_0)\big) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{n}\epsilon_i X_i^{(\rho)}[\rho-\rho_0] - B_n[\rho-\rho_0,\rho-\rho_0] \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n}(X_i^{(\rho)} \otimes X_i^{(z)})[\rho-\rho_0,\hat{z}_n] - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{l=1}^{p_1}\big\{\mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_l) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\big\} \\
&\xrightarrow{P} -B_0[\rho-\rho_0,\rho-\rho_0] =: \mathbb{Y}_0(\rho;\theta_0).
\end{aligned}$$

We get $\mathbb{Y}_0(\rho;\theta_0) \le -\lambda_{\min}(B_0)|\rho-\rho_0|^2$. Therefore, it remains to verify [A1], [A4] and [A6] of Yoshida [10, Theorem 1].

Take $\beta,\ \nu_2,\ \alpha,\ \xi$ and ν_1 as in the argument of the above z-PLDI. Then, from (3.17) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|r_n(v;\theta_0)|}{1+|v|^2} &\le \frac{|v|^2}{1+|v|^2} n^{\beta-1/2} n^{1/2-\beta-\delta}\big(n^\delta |B_n - B_0|\big) \\
&\qquad + \frac{1}{1+|v|^2}\Big|\sum_{l=1}^{p_1}\Big(\mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l}+\frac{v_l}{\sqrt{n}}) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\Big)\Big|.
\end{aligned}$$

We only need to consider the second term of the right hand side. We obtain from (3.9) that for any $l \in \{1,\dots,p_1\}$ there exists a $\kappa \in (0,2]$ such that

$$\Big|\mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\rho_{0l} + \frac{v_l}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\Big| \lesssim |v_l|^\kappa,$$

so that we have

$$\frac{1}{1+|v|^2}\Big|\sum_{l=1}^{p_1}\Big(\mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l}+\frac{v_l}{\sqrt{n}}) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\Big)\Big| \lesssim |v|^{\kappa-2}.$$

Since we can take $\alpha \in (0,1)$ such that $2-\kappa > \xi$ (note that $0 < \xi < (2\alpha/(1-\alpha)) \wedge 1$), we get $\sup_{v\in V_n(r,\theta_0)}|v|^{\kappa-2} \lesssim r^{-\xi}$, where $V_n(r,\theta_0) := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1} : r \le |v| \le n^{(1-\alpha)/2}\}$. Hence, we conclude that for any $r > 0$,

$$\sup_{n>0} P\Big(\sup_{v\in V_n(r,\theta_0)} \frac{|r_n(v;\ \theta_0)|}{1+|v|^2} \gtrsim r^{-\nu_1}\Big) \lesssim \frac{1}{r^L}.$$

Second we will establish [A6]. Note that for all $k > 0$, $E[|\hat{z}_n|^k] \to 0$ is ensured by z-PLDI. Through the same procedure as in (3.14), we have for $N_1 = L(1-\nu_1)^{-1} \ge 2$

$$\sup_{n>0} E\Big[\big|\Delta_n(\theta_0)\big|^{N_1}\Big] < \infty. \tag{3.18}$$

Moreover, from (2.3), (2.23), (3.7) and (3.8), we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{2}{n}\epsilon_i X_i^{(\rho)}[\rho-\rho_0] - B_n[\rho-\rho_0,\rho-\rho_0] - \sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{n}(X_i^{(\rho)}\otimes X_i^{(z)})[\rho-\rho_0,\hat{z}_n]$$
$$\xrightarrow{P} -B_0[\rho-\rho_0,\rho-\rho_0];$$
$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{l=1}^{p_1}\big\{\mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_l)-\mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\big\} \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Hence, we get for $N_2 = L(1-2\beta-\nu_2)^{-1} \geq 2$

$$\sup_{n>0} E\Big[\sup_{\rho\in\Theta_1}\Big\{n^{1/2-\beta}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{2}{n}\epsilon_i X_i^{(\rho)}[\rho-\rho_0] - B_n[\rho-\rho_0,\rho-\rho_0]$$
$$-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{n}(X_i^{(\rho)}\otimes X_i^{(z)})[\rho-\rho_0,\hat{z}_n] + B_0[\rho-\rho_0,\rho-\rho_0]\Big|\Big\}^{N_2}\Big] < \infty; \tag{3.19}$$

$$\sup_{n>0} E\Big[\sup_{\rho\in\Theta_1}\Big\{n^{1/2-\beta}\Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{l=1}^{p_1}\big\{\mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_l)-\mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\big\}\Big|\Big\}^{N_2}\Big] < \infty. \tag{3.20}$$

From (3.18), (3.19) and (3.20), we conclude that [*A*6] holds. □

Remark 3.3 The SCAD penalty (Fan and Li [2]) satisfies (3.8) and (3.9) since

$$\mathfrak{p}_n(\theta_j) = \begin{cases} n\lambda_n|\theta_j| & (|\theta_j|\leq\lambda_n), \\ \dfrac{-n(\theta_j^2 - 2a\lambda_n|\theta_j| + \lambda_n^2)}{2(a-1)} & (\lambda_n < |\theta_j| \leq a\lambda_n), \\ \dfrac{n(a+1)\lambda_n^2}{2} & (|\theta_j| > a\lambda_n), \end{cases}$$

where $a > 2$ is an additional tuning parameter. Let $\lambda_n \leftarrow n^{\beta-1/2}$ where β is the same as in the proof of Theorem 3.2. Then the sparse consistency and the asymptotic normality of $\hat{\rho}_n$ hold. (3.8) follows easily, so that it remains to show (3.9). We have

$$\mathfrak{p}_n'(\theta_j) = \lambda_n n\Big\{\mathrm{I}(\theta_j\leq\lambda_n) + \frac{(a\lambda_n-\theta_j)_+}{(a-1)\lambda_n}\mathrm{I}(\theta_j>\lambda_n)\Big\},$$

where $\theta_j > 0$. Hence when n is large enough, for any $\xi > 0$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Big|\mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\xi+\frac{\zeta}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\xi)\Big| \leq \frac{|\zeta|}{\sqrt{n}}\int_0^1 \Big|\mathfrak{p}'\Big(\xi+\frac{\zeta}{\sqrt{n}}t\Big)\Big|dt$$
$$\leq \lambda_n\sqrt{n}|\zeta|\int_0^1 I\Big(\xi+\frac{\zeta}{\sqrt{n}}t\leq\lambda_n\Big)dt$$
$$+\sqrt{n}|\zeta|\int_0^1 \frac{\big\{a\lambda_n-(\xi+(\zeta/\sqrt{n})t)\big\}_+}{a-1} I\Big(\xi+\frac{\zeta}{\sqrt{n}}t>\lambda_n\Big)dt$$
$$\lesssim |\zeta|.$$

Similarly, we get the same estimation for $\xi < 0$.

The seamless L_0-regularization (Dicker et al. [1]) given by

$$\mathfrak{p}_n(\theta_j) := \frac{2n\lambda_n}{\log 2} \log\Big(\frac{|\theta_j|}{|\theta_j| + \tau_n} + 1 \Big)$$

also satisfies (3.8) and (3.9). For the sparse consistency and the asymptotic normality of $\hat{\rho}_n$, we may set $\lambda_n \leftarrow n^{\beta-1/2}$ and $\tau_n \leftarrow n^{-3/2}$. Then (3.8) follows easily. In order to ensure (3.9), we use the equation

$$|\log(1+x) - \log(1+x')| = \Big| \int_0^1 \frac{ds}{1 + x' + s(x - x')} (x - x') \Big|$$

where $x, x' > 0$. We can show (3.9) by $x \leftarrow (\xi + \zeta/\sqrt{n})/(\tau_n + \xi + \zeta/\sqrt{n})$ and $x' \leftarrow \xi/(\tau_n + \xi)$. □

3.2 Generalization to general mixed-rates M-estimation

Now let us consider the general sparse M-estimation of an additive regularization type:

$$Z_n(\theta) = Z_n(z, \rho) = M_n(\theta) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \mathfrak{p}_n(\theta_j), \tag{3.21}$$

where the regularization term $\sum_{j=1}^{p} \mathfrak{p}_n(\theta_j)$ is the same as in Section 3.1. Note that we are no longer assuming the linear regression model structure (2.1) and also no longer assuming any specific form of the random function $M_n : \Theta = \Theta_0 \times \Theta_1 \to \mathbb{R}$, while we keep setting $\theta = (z, \rho)$ with zero and non-zero true values for z and ρ, respectively. That is, we presuppose that $\theta_0 = (z_0, \rho_0) \in \Theta^\circ$ with $z_{0k} = 0$ and $\rho_{0l} \neq 0$. We define $\hat{\theta}_n = (\hat{z}_n, \hat{\rho}_n)$ to be any minimizer of Z_n over $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, supposed to be compact.

A typical way to establish the consistency is to verify that $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |Z_n(\theta) - Z_0(\theta)| \xrightarrow{P} 0$ for some function Z_0 taking its minimum uniquely at $\theta = \theta_0$; for brevity of presentation, we here assume that Z_0 is non-random. Under the compactness condition of Θ and an appropriate identifiability condition, it is usually not so difficult to verify the consistency; as a matter of fact, we can directly deduce the consistency from Theorem 3.4 below.

Put $\hat{\eta}_n = \hat{\rho}_n - \rho_0$, and let s_n be a positive real such that $s_n \to 0$. Let

$$G_n(z, \eta) := s_n \{ Z_n(z, \rho_0 + \eta) - Z_n(0, \rho_0) \}$$

(typically $s_n = 1/n$). Obviously we have $G_n(z, \eta) \geq G_n(\hat{z}_n, \hat{\eta}_n)$ for each (z, η). We now state two general results from Radchenko [5] in rather simplified forms.

Theorem 3.4 (Lemma 1 of [5]) *Suppose the following conditions:*

(a) $(\hat{z}_n, \hat{\eta}_n) = o_p(1)$;

(b) *There exist positive constants κ, δ, ξ and ν for which $G_n(z, \eta) - G_n(0, 0) = A_n(z, \eta) - B_n(z, \eta)$ where $\delta \geq \kappa$, $\delta > \nu$, $P\{A_n(\hat{z}_n, \hat{\eta}_n) \gtrsim |\hat{z}_n|^\kappa + |\hat{\eta}_n|^\delta\} \to 1$, and $[B_n(\hat{z}_n, \hat{\eta}_n)]_+ = O_p(n^{-\xi} |(\hat{z}_n, \hat{\eta}_n)|^\nu)$.*

Then $n^{\delta\xi/\{\kappa(\delta-\nu)\}}\hat{z}_n = O_p(1)$ *and* $n^{\xi/(\delta-\nu)}\hat{\eta}_n = O_p(1)$.

Theorem 3.4 can be used for establishing the "correct" convergence rate of $\hat{\rho}_n$ and a "preliminary" convergence rate of $\hat{z}_n$ (both of which are $\sqrt{n}$ in case of the bridge-LSE of the linear regression model). To establish the sparse consistency $P(\hat{z}_n = 0) \to 1$, the following result is tailor-made.

Theorem 3.5 (Theorem 2 of [5]) *Suppose the following conditions:*

(a) $\hat{\eta}_n = o_p(1)$;

(b) *There exists a positive constant* $\kappa > 0$ *for which* $P\{G_n(\hat{z}_n, \hat{\eta}_n) - G_n(0, \hat{\eta}_n) \gtrsim |\hat{z}_n|^\kappa\} \to 1$.

Then $P(\hat{z}_n = 0) \to 1$.

In our setting (3.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_n(z,\eta) &= s_n\{M_n(z, \rho_0 + \eta) - M_n(0, \rho_0)\} \\ &\quad + s_n\Big\{\sum_{k=1}^{p_0} \mathfrak{p}_n(z_k) + \sum_{l=1}^{p_1}\big\{\mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l} + \eta_l) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\big\}\Big\}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence $G_n(0,0) \equiv 0$. We also have

$$G_n(z,\eta) - G_n(0,\eta) = s_n\{M_n(z, \rho_0 + \eta) - M_n(0, \rho_0 + \eta)\} + s_n\sum_{k=1}^{p_0}\mathfrak{p}_n(z_k).$$

We further suppose that both $\hat{z}_n$ and $\hat{\rho}_n$ are consistent, hence the condition (a) in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 are fulfilled, and also that $\epsilon_n^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_0) = O_p(1)$ for some $\epsilon_n \downarrow 0$; as in the bridge-LSE case, quite often we have $\epsilon_n^{-1} = \sqrt{n}$ for independent samples. Let us briefly consider the condition (b) of Theorem 3.5. Assume that M_n is smooth in Θ°, with itself and its partial derivatives admitting continuous extensions to the boundary $\partial\Theta$. We will proceed with setting

$$s_n = \epsilon_n^2;$$

for example, this is the case for the bridge-LSE where $s_n = \epsilon_n^2 = n^{-1}$. For each (z, η) the Taylor expansion gives

$$G_n(z,\eta) - G_n(0,\eta) = s_n\partial_z M_n(0, \rho_0 + \eta)[z] + \frac{1}{2}s_n\partial_z^2 M_n(w, \rho_0 + \eta)[z,z] + s_n\sum_{k=1}^{p_0}\mathfrak{p}_n(z_k)$$

for a w lying in the segment connecting zero and z. Let us consider the standard case where the condition (b) is fulfilled with $\kappa = 2$. The condition (b) follows on verifying that there exists a positive constant a_0 such that, with the obvious notation w_n,

$$s_n\partial_z M_n(0, \rho_0 + \hat{\eta}_n)[\hat{z}_n] + \frac{1}{2}s_n\partial_z^2 M_n(w_n, \rho_0 + \hat{\eta}_n)[\hat{z}_n, \hat{z}_n] + s_n\sum_{k=1}^{p_0}\mathfrak{p}_n(\hat{z}_{nk}) \geq a_0|\hat{z}_n|^2 \tag{3.22}$$

with probability tending to 1. It is usual (in ergodic case) that the quadratic term tends to a positive-definite constant matrix. For example, it suffices for the condition (b) to assume that

$$\frac{1}{2}s_n\partial_z^2 M_n(w_n, \rho_0 + \hat{\eta}_n) = C_0 + o_p(1) \tag{3.23}$$

for some $C_0 > 0$, and that

$$s_n\partial_z M_n(0, \rho_0 + \hat{\eta}_n)[\hat{z}_n] + s_n\sum_{k=1}^{p_0}\mathfrak{p}_n(\hat{z}_{nk}) \geq H_n|\hat{z}_n|^2, \tag{3.24}$$

where H_n is a random variable such that $H_n + \lambda_{\min}(C_0) \geq \epsilon_0$ with probability tending to 1 for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ (it is allowed that $H_n \xrightarrow{P} \infty$). Then the probability that the left-hand side of (3.22) is bounded from below by a quantity $\epsilon_0'|\hat{z}_n|^2$ for some $\epsilon_0' > 0$ tends to 1, ensuring the condition (b).

Thus $P(\hat{z}_n = 0) \to 1$ can be deduced. The non-degeneracy assumption (3.23) is quite standard. The assumption (3.24) more or less puts restrictions on the regularization function $\mathfrak{p}_n(\cdot)$.

Having concluded that $P(\hat{z}_n = 0) \to 1$ and that $\epsilon_n^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_0) = O_p(1)$, we proceed to the asymptotic-distribution result. To be precise, we will apply Radchenko [5, Theorem 1], with which we may assume that we beforehand knew the true value zero of z. Define the random function

$$\mathbb{M}_n(u, v) := Z_n(\epsilon_n u, \rho_0 + \epsilon_n v) - Z_n(0, \rho_0). \tag{3.25}$$

Write $\mathbb{M}_n^0(u, v) = M_n(\epsilon_n u, \rho_0 + \epsilon_n v) - M_n(0, \rho_0)$, and let

$$\alpha_n f_n(u) := \sum_{k=1}^{p_0}\mathfrak{p}_n(\epsilon_n u_k),$$

$$\beta_n g_n(u, v) := \mathbb{M}_n^0(u, v) + \sum_{l=1}^{p_1}\{\mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l} + \epsilon_n v_l) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\}$$

for positive reals α_n and β_n satisfying that as $n \to \infty$

$$\beta_n = o(\alpha_n); \tag{3.26}$$

note that it is the condition (3.26) that separates the mixed-rates asymptotics from the standard one; normally, we have $\alpha_n \to \infty$ and $\beta_n \equiv 1$ in the sparse asymptotics. Then we have

$$\mathbb{M}_n(u, v) = \alpha_n f_n(u) + \beta_n g_n(u, v).$$

Write $\hat{u}_n = \epsilon_n^{-1}(\hat{z}_n - z_0) = \epsilon_n^{-1}\hat{z}_n$ and $\hat{v}_n = \epsilon_n^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_0)$, then by the definition we have $\mathbb{M}_n(\hat{u}_n, \hat{v}_n) \leq \mathbb{M}_n(u, v)$ for each (u, v). Now, by means of Radchenko [5, Theorem 1], we can conclude that

$$(\hat{u}_n, \hat{v}_n) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} (0, \hat{v}_0)$$

by verifying the following two conditions: (i) $(f_n(\cdot), g_n(\cdot, \cdot)) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} (f_0(\cdot), g_0(\cdot, \cdot))$ in $\mathcal{C}(K_0 \times K_1)$ for every compact sets $K_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_0}$ and $K_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$; (ii) $u \mapsto f_0(u)$ has a.s. unique minimum at $u = 0$, and $v \mapsto g_0(0, v)$ has a.s. unique minimum at $v = \hat{v}_0$. In our case, these amounts to proving the following:

(a) The regularization function $\mathfrak{p}_n : \mathbb{R} \to [0, \infty)$ (with $\mathfrak{p}_n(0) = 0$) is continuous;

(b) There exists a continuous limit

$$f_0(u) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \sum_{k=1}^{p_0} \mathfrak{p}_n(\epsilon_n u_k),$$

has a.s. unique minimum at zero;

(c) There exists a limit g_0 such that $g_n(\cdot, \cdot) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} g_0(\cdot, \cdot)$ in $\mathcal{C}(K_0 \times K_1)$ for every compact sets $K_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_0}$ and $K_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$;

(d) $v \mapsto g_0(0, v)$ has a.s. unique minimum at $v = \hat{v}_0$.

Concerning (c): the weak convergence of

$$g_n(u, v) = \frac{1}{\beta_n} \mathbb{M}_n^0(u, v) + \frac{1}{\beta_n} \sum_{l=1}^{p_1} \{\mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l} + \epsilon_n v_l) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\},$$

we require the existence of a continuous limit process of the deterministic part:

$$g_0^\natural(v) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\beta_n} \sum_{l=1}^{p_1} \{\mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l} + \epsilon_n v_l) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\}.$$

We may separately consider the random part: there exists $m_0(\cdot, \cdot)$ such that $\mathbb{M}_n^0(\cdot, \cdot)/\beta_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} m_0(\cdot, \cdot)$ in $\mathcal{C}(K_0 \times K_1)$ for every compact sets $K_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_0}$ and $K_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$, typically $(u, v) \mapsto m_0(u, v)$ being a quadratic function. Now we have the correspondence $g_0(0, v) := m_0^0(0, v) + g_0^\natural(v)$, which is to has a.s. unique minimum point $\hat{v}_0$.

Now we make a few comments on derivation of the PLDI associated with the random field (3.25) under (3.26). In principle, we may proceed with mimicking the arguments that we have applied to the bridge-regression model: first we look at the zero parameter z with regarding ρ as nuisance one, and then at the non-zero parameter ρ with plugging-in $\hat{z}_n$. Recall that in the case of the linear regression model in Section 2.2, the LSE term of the $\mathbb{M}_n$ had a "well-behaved" upper bound (3.6) based on which we could make use of completing square to perform the direct application of the Markov inequality for the z-PLDI. This way might not be directly applicable to general $\mathbb{M}_n$. Nevertheless, as in (3.11) the trivial bound

$$\inf_{|u|\geq r} \lambda_n \sum_{k=1}^{p_0} p_n(\epsilon_n u_k) \geq 0$$

would still make sense. Proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we see that verification of (z, ρ)-PLDI reduces to that of the PLDI of the form

$$\sup_{n>0} P\Big[\sup_{|(u,v)|\geq r} \{-g_n(u, v)\} \geq 0 \Big] \lesssim r^{-L},$$

since

$$\sup_{|(u,v)|\geq r}\{-\mathbb{M}_n(u,v)\}\geq 0 \iff \sup_{|(u,v)|\geq r}\{-\beta_n g_n(u,v)\}\geq \inf_{|(u,v)|\geq r}\alpha_n f_n(u)$$
$$\Longrightarrow \sup_{|(u,v)|\geq r}\{-\beta_n g_n(u,v)\}\geq 0.$$

The function $-\beta_n g_n(u,v)$ is typically PLAQ, thereby making it possible to apply the general criterion of Yoshida [10].

3.3 Generalization of the LSE term

Theorem 3.6 *Assume that the contrast function is* (3.21) *where* M_n *is a* $\mathcal{C}^3$ *random function. In addition to* (3.8) *and* (3.9)*, we suppose that*

$$\exists\delta>0,\ \exists\Gamma_0(\rho;\theta_0)>0 : nonrandom,\ \forall k>0,$$
$$\sup_{n>0}E\Big[\sup_{\rho\in\Theta_1}\Big(n^{\delta}\Big|\frac{1}{n}\partial_z^2 M_n(0,\rho)-\Gamma_0(\rho;\theta_0)\Big|\Big)^k\Big]<\infty; \tag{3.27}$$

$$\forall k>0,\ \sup_{n>0}E\Big[\sup_{(z,\rho)\in\Theta_0\times\Theta_1}|\partial_z^3 M_n(z,\rho)|^k\Big]<\infty; \tag{3.28}$$

$$\forall k>0,\ \sup_{n>0}E\Big[\int_{\Theta_1}\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\partial_z M_n(0,\rho)\Big|^k d\rho\Big]<\infty; \tag{3.29}$$

$$\forall k>0,\ \sup_{n>0}E\Big[\int_{\Theta_1}\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\partial_{z\rho}^2 M_n(0,\rho)\Big|^k d\rho\Big]<\infty; \tag{3.30}$$

$$\exists\chi=\chi(\theta_0)>0 : nonrandom, \exists\nu=\nu(\theta_0)>0, \exists\overline{M}_0(z,\rho)\geq\chi|z|^{\nu}, \exists\beta\in(0,1/2), \forall k>0,$$
$$\sup_{n>0}E\Big[\sup_{(z,\rho)\in\Theta_0\times\Theta_1}\Big\{n^{1/2-\beta}\Big|\frac{1}{n}(M_n(z,\rho)-M_n(0,\rho))-\overline{M}_0(z,\rho)\Big|\Big\}^k\Big]<\infty; \tag{3.31}$$

$$\exists\delta>0,\ \exists\Gamma_0(\theta_0)>0 : nonrandom,\ \forall k>0,$$
$$\sup_{n>0}E\Big[\Big(n^{\delta}\Big|\frac{1}{n}\partial_\rho^2 M_n(\hat{z}_n,\rho_0)-\Gamma_0(\theta_0)\Big|\Big)^k\Big]<\infty; \tag{3.32}$$

$$\forall k>0,\ \sup_{n>0}E\Big[\sup_{\rho\in\Theta_1}|\partial_\rho^3 M_n(\hat{z}_n,\rho)|^k\Big]<\infty; \tag{3.33}$$

$$\forall k>0,\ \sup_{n>0}E\Big[\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\partial_\rho M_n(\hat{z}_n,\rho_0)\Big|^k\Big]<\infty; \tag{3.34}$$

$$\exists \chi = \chi(\theta_0) > 0 : \textit{nonrandom},\ \exists \nu = \nu(\theta_0) > 0,\ \exists \overline{M}_0(\rho) \geq \chi|\rho|^q,\ \exists \beta \in (0, 1/2),\ \forall k > 0,$$
$$\sup_{n>0} E\Big[\sup_{\rho \in \Theta_1} \Big\{ n^{1/2-\beta} \Big| \frac{1}{n}(M_n(\hat{z}_n, \rho) - M_n(\hat{z}_n, \rho_0)) - \overline{M}_0(\rho) \Big| \Big\}^k \Big] < \infty. \tag{3.35}$$

Then the PLDI (3.10) *holds. In particular, for every continuous* $f : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}$ *of at most polynomial growth*

$$E\big[f\big(\sqrt{n}\hat{z}_n, \sqrt{n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_0) \big) \big] \to E[f(0, \hat{v}_0)],$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\hat{v}_0)$ *is an asymptotic law of* $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_0)$.

Proof We will derive z-PLDI by mimicking the argument of the proof of Theorem 3.2. The Taylor expansion gives

$$\begin{aligned} -M_n\Big(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}, \rho \Big) + M_n(0, \rho) &= -\partial_z M_n(0, \rho)\Big[\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}} \Big] - \int_0^1 (1-s) \partial_z^2 M_n\Big(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}} s, \rho \Big) ds \Big[\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{u}{\sqrt{n}} \Big] \\ &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \partial_z M_n(0, \rho)[u] - \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_0(\rho; \theta_0)[u, u] \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 (1-s) \Big\{ -\frac{1}{n} \partial_z^2 M_n\Big(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}} s, \rho \Big) + \Gamma_0(\rho; \theta_0) \Big\} ds[u, u]. \end{aligned}$$

For the PLAQ structure, we set

$$\Delta_n(\rho; \theta_0) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \partial_z M_n(0, \rho); \tag{3.36}$$

$$r_n(u, \rho; \theta_0) = \int_0^1 (1-s) \Big\{ -\frac{1}{n} \partial_z^2 M_n\Big(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}} s, \rho \Big) + \Gamma_0(\rho; \theta_0) \Big\} ds[u, u]. \tag{3.37}$$

Moreover, we obtain for any $(z, \rho) \in \Theta_0 \times \Theta_1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Y}_n(z, \rho; \theta_0) := -\frac{1}{n}(Z_n(z, \rho) - Z_n(0, \rho)) &= -\frac{1}{n}\big(M_n(z, \rho) - M_n(0, \rho) \big) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{p_0} \mathfrak{p}_n(z_k) \\ &\xrightarrow{P} -\overline{M}_0(z, \rho) =: \mathbb{Y}_0(z, \rho; \theta_0). \end{aligned}$$

We get $\mathbb{Y}_0(z; \theta_0) \leq -\chi|z|^\nu$ from (3.31). Therefore, it remains to verify [A1], [A4] and [A6] of Yoshida [10, Theorem 1].

Take $\beta,\ \nu_2,\ \alpha$ and ξ as in the proof of Theorem 2.1. From (3.37), we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_n(u, \rho; \theta_0) = \int_0^1 (1-s) \Big\{ &-\frac{1}{n} \partial_z^2 M_n(0, \rho) - \frac{1}{n} \int_0^1 \partial_z^3 M_n\Big(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}} st, \rho \Big) dt \Big[\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}} s \Big] \\ &+ \Gamma_0(\rho; \theta_0) \Big\} ds[u, u], \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|r_n(u, \rho; \theta_0)|}{1 + |u|^2} &\lesssim \frac{|u|^2}{1 + |u|^2} n^{\beta - 1/2} n^{1/2 - \beta - \delta} \Big(n^\delta \Big| -\frac{1}{n} \partial_z^2 M_n(0, \rho) + \Gamma_0(\rho; \theta_0) \Big| \Big) \\ &\quad + \frac{|u|^2}{1 + |u|^2} \frac{|u|}{n\sqrt{n}} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \Big| \partial_z^3 M_n\Big(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}} st, \rho \Big) \Big| dt ds. \end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

We have $|u|/n\sqrt{n} \le r^{-(\alpha+2)/(1-\alpha)}$ on $U_n(r,\theta_0)$ so that we can estimate the second term of the right-hand side of (3.38) such that

$$P\Big\{ \sup_{(u,\rho)\in U_n(r,\theta_0)\times\Theta_1} \Big(\frac{|u|^2}{1+|u|^2} \frac{|u|}{n\sqrt{n}} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \Big| \partial_z^3 M_n\Big(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}} st, \rho \Big) \Big| dtds \Big) \ge r^{-\nu_1} \Big\}$$
$$\lesssim (r^{-\nu_1 + \frac{\alpha+2}{1-\alpha}})^{-L} E\Big[\sup_{(u,\rho)\in U_n(r,\theta_0)\times\Theta_1} \Big(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \Big| \partial_z^3 M_n\Big(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}} st, \rho \Big) \Big| dtds \Big)^L \Big].$$

Let us take $0 < \nu_1 < \xi \wedge (\alpha+2)/(1-\alpha)$, then from (3.27) and (3.28), we get for any $r > 0$

$$\sup_{n>0} P\Big(\sup_{(u,\rho)\in U_n(r,\theta_0)\times\Theta_1} \frac{|r_n(u,\rho;\theta_0)|}{1+|u|^2} \gtrsim r^{-\nu_1} \Big) \lesssim \frac{1}{r^L}. \tag{3.39}$$

Second, we will establish [A6]. From (3.29), (3.30), (3.36) and using Sobolev's inequality, we can estimate for $N_1 = L(1-\nu_1)^{-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{n>0} E\Big[\sup_{\rho\in\Theta_1} |\Delta_n(\rho;\theta_0)|^{N_1} \Big] &= \sup_{n>0} E\Big[\sup_{\rho\in\Theta_1} \Big| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \partial_z M_n(0,\rho) \Big|^{N_1} \Big] \\ &\lesssim \sup_{n>0} E\Big[\int_{\Theta_1} \Big| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \partial_z M_n(0,\rho) \Big|^{N_1} d\rho \Big] \\ &\quad + \sup_{n>0} E\Big[\int_{\Theta_1} \Big| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \partial_{z\rho}^2 M_n(0,\rho) \Big|^{N_1} d\rho \Big] < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Further, from (3.8) and (3.31), we obtain for $M_2 = L(1-2\beta-\nu_2)^{-1}$,

$$\sup_{\xi_0\in K} \sup_{n>0} E\Big[\Big(\sup_{(\theta,\tau)\in\Theta\times\mathcal{T}} n^{1/2-\beta} \big| \mathbb{Y}_n(\theta,\tau;\xi_0) - \mathbb{Y}_0(\theta,\tau;\xi_0) \big| \Big)^{M_2} \Big] < \infty.$$

We conclude that [A6] holds, hence the z-PLDI.

Next we consider the ρ-PLDI.

$$\begin{aligned} &Z_n\Big(\hat{z}_n, \rho_0 + \frac{v}{\sqrt{n}} \Big) - Z_n(\hat{z}_n, \rho_0) \\ &= \partial_\rho M_n(\hat{z},\rho_0)\Big[\frac{v}{\sqrt{n}} \Big] + \int_0^1 (1-s) \partial_\rho^2 M_n\Big(\hat{z}_n, \rho_0 + \frac{v}{\sqrt{n}} s \Big) ds \Big[\frac{v}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{v}{\sqrt{n}} \Big] \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=1}^{p_1} \Big\{ \mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\rho_{0l} + \frac{v_l}{\sqrt{n}} \Big) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l}) \Big\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \partial_\rho M_n(\hat{z}_n,\rho_0)[v] + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_0(\theta_0)[v,v] \\ &+ \int_0^1 (1-s) \Big\{ \frac{1}{n} \partial_\rho^2 M_n\Big(\hat{z}_n, \rho_0 + \frac{v}{\sqrt{n}} s \Big) - \Gamma_0(\theta_0) \Big\} ds[v,v] + \sum_{l=1}^{p_1} \Big\{ \mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\rho_{0l} + \frac{v_l}{\sqrt{n}} \Big) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l}) \Big\} \end{aligned}$$

For the PLAQ structure, we set

$$\Delta_n(\theta_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\partial_\rho M_n(\hat{z}_n, \rho_0); \tag{3.40}$$

$$\begin{aligned} r_n(v;\theta_0) &= \int_0^1 (1-s)\Big\{\frac{1}{n}\partial_\rho^2 M_n\Big(\hat{z}_n, \rho_0 + \frac{v}{\sqrt{n}}s\Big) - \Gamma_0(\theta_0)\Big\}ds[v,v] \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=1}^{p_1}\Big\{\mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\rho_{0l} + \frac{v_l}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

From (3.35), we obtain for any $\rho \in \Theta_1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Y}_n(\rho;\theta_0) &:= \frac{1}{n}\big(-Z_n(\hat{z}_n,\rho) + Z_n(\hat{z}_n,\rho_0)\big) \\ &= -\frac{1}{n}\big(M_n(\hat{z}_n,\rho) - M_n(\hat{z}_n,\rho_0)\big) - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{l=1}^{p_1}\big(\mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_l) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\big) \\ &\xrightarrow{P} -\overline{M}_0(\rho) =: \mathbb{Y}_0(\rho;\theta_0). \end{aligned}$$

and $\mathbb{Y}_0(\rho;\theta_0) \le -\chi|\rho|^q$. Therefore, it remains to verify [A1], [A4] and [A6] of Yoshida [10, Theorem 1].

Take β, ν_2, α, ξ and ν_1 as in the argument of the above z-PLDI. From (3.41), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &r_n(v;\theta_0) \\ &= \int_0^1 (1-s)\Big\{\frac{1}{n}\partial_\rho^2 M_n(\hat{z}_n,\rho_0) + \frac{1}{n}\int_0^1 \partial_\rho^3 M_n\Big(\hat{z}_n, \rho_0 + \frac{v}{\sqrt{n}}st\Big)dt\Big[\frac{v}{\sqrt{n}}s\Big] - \Gamma_0(\theta_0)\Big\}ds[v,v] \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=1}^{p_1}\Big\{\mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\rho_{0l} + \frac{v_l}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\Big\}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|r_n(v;\theta_0)|}{1+|v|^2} &\lesssim \frac{|v|^2}{1+|v|^2} n^{\beta-1/2} n^{1/2-\beta-\delta}\Big(n^\delta\Big|\frac{1}{n}\partial_\rho^2 M_n(\hat{z}_n,\rho_0) - \Gamma_0(\theta_0)\Big|\Big) \\ &\quad + \frac{|v|^2}{1+|v|^2}\frac{|v|}{n\sqrt{n}}\int_0^1\int_0^1 \Big|\partial_\rho^3 M_n\Big(\hat{z}_n, \rho_0 + \frac{v}{\sqrt{n}}st\Big)\Big|dtds. \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{1+|v|^2}\Big|\sum_{l=1}^{p_1}\Big\{\mathfrak{p}_n\Big(\rho_{0l} + \frac{v_l}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) - \mathfrak{p}_n(\rho_{0l})\Big\}\Big| \end{aligned}$$

From (3.9), (3.32) and (3.33), we can use the same method as in the estimation of (3.39).

Apparently [A6] holds since we have (3.8), (3.34), (3.35) and (3.40), hence we obtain the claim. □

4 Special case of the Bridge-LSE

Again we consider the bridge-LSE. Here we consider the case of $\lambda_n/n \to \exists\lambda_0 > 0$. Knight and Fu [3] proved the convergence of $\hat{\theta}_n$ in their Theorem 1:

$$\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{P} \operatorname*{argmin}_{\theta\in\Theta} \Big\{ (\theta-\theta_0)^\top C_0(\theta-\theta_0) + \lambda_0 \sum_{j=1}^{p} |\theta_j|^\gamma \Big\},$$

where the consistency of $\hat{\theta}_n$ to the true value of parameter no longer holds. Then we assume that

$$\operatorname*{argmin}_{\theta\in\Theta} \Big\{ (\theta-\theta_0)^\top C_0(\theta-\theta_0) + \lambda_0 \sum_{j=1}^{p} |\theta_j|^\gamma \Big\} =: (z_0', \rho_0') = (0, \rho_0') \in \Theta_0' \times \Theta_1' \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_0'} \times \mathbb{R}^{p_1'}.$$

We can rewrite the linear regression model (2.1) and the contrast function (2.2) to

$$Y_i = z_0^\top X_i^{(z)} + \rho_0^\top X_i^{(\rho)} + \epsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n;$$
$$Z_n(\theta) = Z_n(z,\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \big(Y_i - z^\top X_i^{(z)} - \rho^\top X_i^{(\rho)}\big)^2 + \lambda_n \sum_{k=1}^{p_0'} |z_k|^\gamma + \lambda_n \sum_{l=1}^{p_1'} |\rho_l|^\gamma,$$

where z_0 and ρ_0 are the true-value vectors corresponding to z_0' and ρ_0', respectively. Note that $X_i^{(z)}$ and $X_i^{(\rho)}$ are p_0' and p_1' dimensional vectors respectively. Denote the estimator associated with Z_n by $\hat{\theta}_n = (\hat{z}_n', \hat{\rho}_n')$. In the present model setting, we will prove the PLDI of $\hat{u}_n := \sqrt{n}\hat{z}_n'$ and the sparse consistency:

$$P(\hat{z}_n' = 0) \to 1.$$

We will prove the PLDI of $\hat{u}_n$, but this is almost the same as in Theorem 3.1: $p_0 \leftarrow p_0'$, $\mathfrak{p}_n(u_k/\sqrt{n}) \leftarrow \lambda_n |u_k/\sqrt{n}|^\gamma$, $q_n \leftarrow \lambda_n/n^{\gamma/2}$, $f(r) \leftarrow r^\gamma$. Hence, in addition to the conditions of Theorem 3.1, we can easily deduce that we need

$$\sup_{n>0} \Big| (n^{-(1-\gamma/4)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i^{(z)} \otimes X_i^{(z)}) \Big| < \infty$$

to derive the PLDI.

For the sparse consistency, we check the conditions (a), (b) of Radchenko [5, Theorem 2]. Apparently, (a) $\hat{\eta}_n' := \hat{\rho}_n' - \rho_0' = o_p(1)$ holds, so that it remains to verify (b). To this end, we establish (3.22). Let

$$G_n(z,\eta) := \frac{1}{n} \left\{ Z_n(z, \rho_0' + \eta) - Z_n(0, \rho_0') \right\}.$$

Then, we have

$$G_n(\hat{z}_n', \hat{\eta}_n') - G_n(0, \hat{\eta}_n') = -\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \{\epsilon_i + z_0^\top X_i^{(z)} - (\hat{\rho}_n' - \rho_0)^\top X_i^{(\rho)}\} X_i^{(z)}[\hat{z}_n']$$

$$+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^{(z)} X_i^{(z)\top}[\hat{z}'_n, \hat{z}'_n] + \frac{\lambda_n}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{p'_0} |\hat{z}'_{nk}|^\gamma. \tag{4.1}$$

The sum of the first and third terms in the right-hand side of (4.1) is bounded:

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{2}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\{\epsilon_i + z_0^\top X_i^{(z)} - (\hat{\rho}'_n - \rho_0)^\top X_i^{(\rho)}\} X_i^{(z)}[\hat{z}'_n] + \frac{\lambda_n}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{p'_0}|\hat{z}'_{nk}|^\gamma \\ &\gtrsim O_p(|\hat{z}'_n| n^{-1/2}) + O_p(|\hat{z}'_n|\sqrt{d_n} n^{-1/2}) + |\hat{z}'_n|^\gamma, \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where $d_n := \lambda_n / n^{\gamma/2}$. On the other hand, when n is large enough, the second term of the right-hand side of (4.1) is also bounded:

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^{(z)} X_i^{(z)\top}[\hat{z}'_n, \hat{z}'_n] \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(C_0)}{2}|\hat{z}'_n|^2. \tag{4.3}$$

Hence from (4.2), (4.3) and making use of $\sqrt{n}\hat{z}'_n = O_p(1)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} G_n(\hat{z}'_n, \hat{\eta}'_n) - G_n(0, \hat{\eta}'_n) &\gtrsim O_p\big(|\hat{z}'_n|(1+\sqrt{d_n})n^{-1/2}\big) + |\hat{z}'_n|^2 + |\hat{z}'_n|^\gamma \\ &\gtrsim |\hat{z}'_n|^2\Big[1 + \frac{1}{|\hat{z}'_n|^{2-\gamma}}\Big\{1 + O_p\Big(|\sqrt{n}\hat{z}'_n|^{1-\gamma}\frac{1+\sqrt{d_n}}{n^{1-\gamma/2}}\Big)\Big\}\Big] \\ &\gtrsim |\hat{z}'_n|^2\Big[1 + \frac{1}{|\hat{z}'_n|^{2-\gamma}}\Big\{1 + O_p\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d_n}}\Big)\Big\}\Big] \\ &\gtrsim |\hat{z}'_n|^2\Big[1 + \frac{1}{|\hat{z}'_n|^{2-\gamma}}\big\{1 + o_p(1)\big\}\Big] \\ &\gtrsim |\hat{z}'_n|^2. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we can establish (b) as $\kappa = 2$:

$$P\{G_n(\hat{z}'_n, \hat{\eta}'_n) - G_n(0, \hat{\eta}'_n) \gtrsim |\hat{z}'_n|^2\} \to 1.$$

This means $P(\hat{z}'_n = 0) \to 1$.

References

[1] Dicker, L., Huang, B., Lin, X. (2012). Variable selection and estimation with the seamless-L_0 penalty. *Statistica Sinica*, 23(2), 929-962.

[2] Fan, J., Li, R. (2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96(456), 1348-1360.

[3] Knight, K., Fu, W. (2000). Asymptotics for lasso-type estimators. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1356-1378.

[4] Radchenko, P. (2005). Reweighting the lasso. *2005 Proceedings of the American Statistical Association [CD-ROM]*, http://www-rcf.usc.edu/∼radchenk/Lasso.pdf

[5] Radchenko, P. (2008). Mixed-rates asymptotics. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(1), 287-309.

[6] Sakamoto, Y., Yoshida, N. (2004). Asymptotic expansion formulas for functionals of ϵ-Markov processes with a mixing property. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 56(3), 545-597.

[7] Uchida, M., Yoshida, N. (2001). Information criteria in model selection for mixing processes. *Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes*, 4(1), 73-98.

[8] Uchida, M., Yoshida, N. (2006). Asymptotic expansion and information criteria. *SUT Journal of Mathematics*, 42(1), 31-58.

[9] van der Vaart, A. W. (1998). Asymptotic Statistics. *Cambridge University Press*.

[10] Yoshida, N. (2011). Polynomial type large deviation inequalities and quasi-likelihood analysis for stochastic differential equations. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 63(3), 431-479.